UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,624	05/13/2005	Venkateswarlu Jasti	03108/0202225-US0	8919

7278 7590 11/09/2006

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P. O. BOX 5257
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257

EXAMINER	
NOLAN, JASON MICHAEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1626	

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,624	JASTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D.	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6,7,12,13 and 15-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6,7,12 and 15-18* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,4 and 13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 12, 13 & 15-18 are currently pending in the instant application; of which all are amended (**Claim 6** is missing a status identifier). **Claims 5, 8-11, 14 & 19** have been cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

An information disclosure statement (IDS) has not been filed by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while enabling for compositions and a method of *treatment* of migraine headaches, does not reasonably provide enablement for the *prophylaxis* or treatment of the plethora of diseases listed in **Claims 15-18**. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01(a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is 'undue'."

case, the claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that a group of compounds and compositions may provide a treatment for migraines, but it does not mean that the same group of compounds and compositions may treat or prevent Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, depression, etc.

The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples

In the specification, on pages 25-31, is experimental guidance for conducting radioligand binding assays for various 5-HT receptor sub-types; however, no data is articulated for the compounds of formula (I). It is unknown from the specification if the compounds and compositions according to formula (I) are able to bind to the different receptors and whether their binding affinities would be useful as compared to known drugs. The specification, on pages 4-5, lists patent applications that establish a relationship between the use of indoles (the same class of compounds) for the treatment of migraine and cluster headaches; however, it is unclear from the specification if indoles are useful for treating the plethora of diseases currently claimed.

There is no direction or guidance provided which supports Applicant's claimed method for the *prophylaxis* of any disease as claimed.

The breadth of the claims, quantity of experimentation, and level of skill in the art

Claims 15-18 are drawn to methods for treating numerous diseases. Prophylaxis is commonly known to be synonymous with prevention. In order to prevent a disease, one would need to precisely identify those subjects likely to acquire such a disease, administer Applicant's claimed invention, and then demonstrate that if the

In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), discusses the following factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:

1. ***The nature of the invention;***
2. ***The state of the prior art;***
3. ***The predictability or lack thereof in the art;***
4. ***The amount of direction or guidance present;***
5. ***The presence or absence of working examples;***
6. ***The breadth of the claims;***
7. ***The quantity of experimentation needed; and***
8. ***The level of skill in the art***

each of which is discussed in turn below.

The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is compounds and compositions of Formula (I) and methods of using these compounds.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art, namely pharmacological art, involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine if the compounds exhibit desired pharmacological activities, which are then tested for their efficacy on human beings. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below.

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant

identified subject did not develop the disease, such an effect was the direct result of administration of the claimed invention.

Because of the aforementioned reasons, a person of skill in the art could not practice the claimed invention herein, or a person of skill in the art could practice the claimed invention herein only with undue experimentation and with no assurance of success. Deleting the word "prophylaxis" in **Claims 15 & 16** and revising the scope of the claim language can overcome this rejection.

Claims 1 & 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compounds of the formula (I), including stereoisomers, tautomers and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof; the specification is not enabled for *derivatives, analogs, polymorphs, or solvates* thereof. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The Nature of the Invention

The nature of the invention is the compounds of formula (I), including all derivatives, analogs, tautomeric forms, stereoisomers, polymorphs, and pharmaceutically acceptable salts or solvates thereof.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

Active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) are frequently delivered to the patient in the solid-state as part of an approved dosage form (e.g., tablets, capsules, etc.). Solids

provide a convenient, compact and generally stable format to store an API or a drug product. Understanding and controlling the solid-state chemistry of APIs, both as pure drug substances and in formulated products, is therefore an important aspect of the drug development process. APIs can exist in a variety of distinct solid forms, including polymorphs, solvates, hydrates, salts, co-crystals and amorphous solids. Each form displays unique physicochemical properties that can profoundly influence the bioavailability, manufacturability purification, stability and other performance characteristics of the drug. Hence, it is critical to understand the relationship between the particular solid form of a compound and its functional properties.

For ionizable compounds, preparation of salt forms using pharmaceutically acceptable acids and bases is a common strategy to improve bioavailability. However, the preparation of other solid forms such as polymorphs and solvates are not so common as to be predictable. In order to obtain patent protection on these forms, some of which may have significantly different properties and relevance as development candidates, it is essential to prepare them, identify conditions for making them and evaluate their properties as valuable new pharmaceutical materials. A large number of factors can influence crystal nucleation and growth during this process, including the composition of the crystallization medium and the processes used to generate super-saturation and promote crystallization, (Morissette *et al.* Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews **2004**, *56*, 275-300).

For instance, the phenomenon of polymorphism, in the crystallization of organic compounds, is of crucial importance to the pharmaceutical industry. Two polymorphs of

the same drug molecule may have different physical properties: e.g. solubility, bioavailability, melting points, density, hardness, or color; and may have dramatically different properties that effect the scale-up process. Due to the differences between polymorphs, the drug regulatory authorities (e.g. the FDA) are increasingly demanding more information about potential drug products before granting approval. The conditions under which polymorphs interconvert is also of crucial importance, particularly when drugs may encounter exposure to changes in temperature, pressure, and relative humidity during processes such as drying, granulation, milling, compression, and storage. Therefore, for these reasons, the state of the prior art is one of unpredictability. The science of crystallization has evolved such that said differences in properties implies patentable distinctiveness between polymorphs.

Amount of direction/guidance & presence or absence of working examples

The direction or guidance present in the instant specification for the preparation of polymorphs for the compounds of formula (I) is on page 23 of the specification, lines 3-12. The disclosure identifies methods of preparing polymorphs (crystallization, recrystallization, solidification) and methods of identifying polymorphs (powder X-ray diffraction, NMR, etc.). However, there are no working examples present in the disclosure. Therefore, one of skill in the art would be required to identify the correct solvent system and crystallization technique for each compound and, further, identify the similarities and differences between crystals and corresponding spectral data for each compound (polymorph) in order to determine what is being claimed.

The breadth of the claims

The instant breadth of the rejected claims is broader than the disclosure, specifically; the instant claims include any derivatives, analogs, polymorphs, or solvates.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

While the level of the skill in the pharmaceutical arts is high, it would require undue experimentation of one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare *any* derivatives, analogs, polymorphs, or solvates of a compound of formula (I) as instantly claimed. The science of crystallization has evolved such that, without guidance or working examples for polymorphs in the specification, the claims lack enablement. This rejection can be overcome by deletion of the words "derivatives, analogs, polymorphs, or solvates" from the **Claims 1 & 2**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The term "modulating" in **Claims 6, 7 & 12** is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "modulating" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Examiner suggests canceling said claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 4 & 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4356** and electronic mail is **Jason.Nolan@uspto.gov**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (9:00 - 5:30PM). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph M^{c}Kane** can be reached on **(571) 272-0699**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAMAL A. SAEED, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1626

Joseph K. M^{c}Kane
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626
Date: November 3, 2006